

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 15, 16, 18 and 19 stand rejected. Claims 4, 6, 13, 14, 17 and 20 stand objected to.

1. Objections to the Specification

On January 3, 2006, Applicants filed an amendment after the Final Office Action of November 1, 2005. On January 18, 2006, the Examiner indicated in the Advisory Action that the proposed amendments would be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal brief with requisite fees. On February 28, 2006, Applicants filed a Notice of Appeal and Appeal brief with requisite fees.

Applicants believe that the objections identified in the Office Action of June 28, 2006 were in the Final Office Action of November 1, 2005. Applicants believe that the Amendment filed on January 3, 2006, which Applicants believe was entered, addresses each of the below-identified objections. However, Applicants are presenting these amendments and remarks again. Applicants note that the Examiner did not object to claims 14 and 19, which are now shown in the listing of claims above as "previously presented", include the word --respective-- preceding the word "thickfilms" in claim 14, and include the word --respective-- preceding the word "mounds" in claim 19.

The Examiner objects to paragraph [0016] because he believes the phrase "is shielded 106, 108" is an incomplete recitation. The Examiner has further suggested that Applicants amend paragraph [0016] to state, "[a]s defined herein, a quasi-coax transmission line 100 comprises a conductor 104, the cross-section of which is shielded 106, 108 (e.g., by shields 106, 108) in a non-symmetrical fashion." Applicants have amended paragraph [0016] accordingly for the Examiner's convenience. Applicants believe their amended paragraph [0016] provides the same disclosure as their original paragraph [0016], and does not introduce new matter.

The Examiner objects to paragraph [0025] because he believes phrases such as "deposited 902" should be rewritten as "deposited by step 902." Applicants have amended paragraph [0025] accordingly for the Examiner's convenience. Applicants believe their amended paragraph [0025] provides the same disclosure as original paragraph [0025], and does not introduce new matter.

The Examiner also objects to the specification because, "the following reference labels need description relative to the corresponding figure: fig. 4 (218); fig. 8, all reference labels except (700, 702, 704)." The Examiner has suggested that Applicants "provide a statement indicating that like reference numbers in different drawing figures refer to the same element/feature and may not be described in detail for all drawing figures." In response, Applicants have added new paragraph [0015.1] to incorporate the Examiner's suggested language. The recitations in this added paragraph [0015.1] are not substantive, and it is believed that this paragraph does not introduce new matter.

All of the above amendments to the specification are believed to be clerical in nature, and none are believed to add new matter.

2. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 15, 16 and 18 Under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 15, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Ishikawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,652,557; hereinafter "Ishikawa".) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 as originally filed calls for apparatus comprising **a layer of dielectric**; a plurality of conductors; a plurality of dielectric mounds, wherein **each of the conductors is encapsulated between the layer of dielectric and a corresponding one of the dielectric mounds**; and a first ground shield positioned below the layer of dielectric, and a second ground shield positioned above the dielectric mounds. (Emphasis added.)

As described in the specification and illustrated in the drawings as originally filed, "FIGS. 2 & 3 illustrate a plurality of quasi-coax transmission lines 200, 202 formed in accordance with the methods disclosed herein." (See, paragraph [0017], lines 9 and 10, on page 4 of the specification.) "Referring to FIG. 3, it can be seen that a plurality of (i.e., two or more) conductor 204, 206 are encapsulated between **a layer of dielectric 208** and a corresponding one of the dielectric mounds 210, 212. That is, each of the conductors 204, 206 is encapsulated between **the layer of dielectric 208** and a corresponding one of the dielectric mounds 210, 212." (Emphasis added, and see, paragraph [0018], lines 13-17, on page 4 of the specification.) The term "layer" is commonly defined as "A usually horizontal deposit or expanse; a stratum" (see, The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition Copyright © 2004, 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company.)

As described in the specification, and illustrated in FIGS. 2-4 and 8, it is apparent that the claimed invention calls for an apparatus having each of the conductors encapsulated between the layer of dielectric (i.e., the deposit or expanse) and a corresponding one of the dielectric mounds.

Applicants have carefully reviewed Ishikawa, and assert that Ishikawa discloses a dielectric substrate (1) having a grounded conductor (2) formed on the rear surface of the substrate (1). Ishikawa further discloses a microstrip conductor line (3) formed on the front surface of the substrate (1). However, microstrip (3) is formed on dielectric (5) formed in the groove surrounded by first metallization (4). As shown in FIG. 11, a second dielectric (6) is formed on and makes contact with the first burying dielectric (5) and microstrip conductor line (3). In other words, Ishikawa discloses a plurality of microstrip conductor lines (3) encapsulated between a plurality of second dielectric layers (6) and a plurality of individual dielectric regions (5) in which the plurality of individual dielectric regions (5) are each separated from dielectric substrate (1) by first metallization film (4) on the surface of the grooves therein. Applicants further assert that Ishikawa does not disclose, and in fact teaches away from, an apparatus having each of the conductors encapsulated between **a layer of dielectric** (i.e., a deposit or expanse) and a corresponding one of a plurality of dielectric mounds. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 12 each depend either directly or ultimately from independent claim 1 and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the above-identified reasons. Accordingly, allowance of claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 12 is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 as originally filed calls for a method for forming transmission lines, comprising **depositing a plurality of conductors on a layer of dielectric** that is positioned above a first ground shield; depositing a respective mound of dielectric over each conductor; and depositing a second ground shield over the mounds of dielectric. (Emphasis added.)

As discussed above, and as described in the specification, and illustrated in FIGS. 2-4 and 8, it is apparent that the claimed invention calls for a method for forming transmission lines including depositing a plurality of conductors on a layer of dielectric (i.e., a deposit or expanse).

Applicants have carefully reviewed Ishikawa, and assert that Ishikawa discloses forming dielectric (5) in a groove, forming a microstrip conductor line (3) on dielectric (5), and forming a second dielectric (6) on and in contact with the first burying dielectric (5). In other words, Ishikawa discloses depositing a plurality of microstrip conductor lines (3) on a plurality of individual dielectric regions (5) in which the plurality of individual dielectric regions (5) are each separated from dielectric substrate (1) by first metallization film (4) on the surface of the grooves therein. Applicants further assert that Ishikawa does not disclose, and in fact teaches away from, a method for forming transmission lines including depositing a plurality of conductors on **a layer of dielectric** (i.e., the deposit or expanse). Accordingly, claim 15 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 16 and 18 each depend either directly or ultimately from independent claim 15 and are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the above-identified reasons. Accordingly, allowance of claims 16 and 18 is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of Claims 10, 11 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 10, 11 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above rejection applied to claims 1 and 15, respectively above [under 35 USC 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Ishikawa] and further in view of Dove et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,979; hereinafter "Dove").

Applicants assert that Dove does not teach that which applicants have already argued is missing from Ishikawa. As a result, Applicants believe that claims 10, 11 and 19 are allowable at least for the reasons that claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable over Ishikawa for the reasons presented in Section 2 of these Remarks/Arguments, and that claim 16 depends from claim 15, which is believed to be allowable over Ishikawa for the reasons presented in Section 2 of these Remarks/Arguments.

4. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 4, 6, 13, 14, 17 and 20, which stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Inasmuch as claims 4, 6, 13, 14, depend from independent claim 1, and claims 17 and 20 depend from independent claim 15, Applicants believe that claims 15-17 are allowable for the reasons presented in Section 2 of these Remarks/Arguments.

Appl. No. 10/762,143
Response dated August 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2006

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DAHL & OSTERLOTH, L.L.P.

James A. Sheridan
By: AUGUST 30, 2006
James A. Sheridan
Reg. No. 43,114
Tel: (303) 291-3200